

Faddeev-Niemi Conjecture and Effective Action of QCD

Y. M. Cho¹, H. W. Lee², and D. G. Pak^{3,4}

¹⁾*Department of Physics, College of Natural Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea*

²⁾*Department of Physics, College of Natural Sciences, Chungbuk University, Chungju, Korea*

³⁾*Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics, 207-43 Cheongryangri-dong, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130-012, Korea*

⁴⁾*Department of Theoretical Physics, Tashkent State University, Tashkent 700-095, Uzbekistan*

ymcho@yongmin.snu.ac.kr, dmipak@apctp.kaist.ac.kr

We calculate a one loop effective action of $SU(2)$ QCD in the presence of the monopole background, and find a possible connection between the resulting QCD effective action and a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev action of the non-linear sigma model. The result is obtained using the gauge-independent decomposition of the gauge potential into the topological degrees which describes the non-Abelian monopoles and the local dynamical degrees of the potential, and integrating out all the dynamical degrees of QCD.

PACS numbers: 12.38.-t, 11.15.-q, 12.38.Aw, 11.10.Lm

Recently Faddeev and Niemi have discovered the knot-like topological solitons in the Skyrme-type non-linear sigma model [1], and made an interesting conjecture that the Skyrme-Faddeev action could be interpreted as an effective action for QCD in the low energy limit [2]. On the other hand it is generally believed that QCD in the low energy limit must exhibit the confinement of color, and it has long been argued that the confinement could take place through the condensation of the monopole which generates the dual Meissner effect [3,4]. So, in order to reconcile the Faddeev-Niemi conjecture with the confinement, one must be able to construct the effective action of QCD from the first principles and produce the mass scale that the Skyrme-Faddeev action contains, which could demonstrate the dynamical symmetry breaking and triggers the confinement of color in QCD [4,5]. However, a rigorous derivation of an effective action of QCD which could generate the desired monopole condensation has been extremely difficult [6,7]. Fortunately several authors have recently been able to argue that one can indeed derive a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev action from the effective action of QCD in the infra-red limit, at least in some approximation [8,9].

The purpose of this paper is to study the Faddeev-Niemi conjecture in more detail. Our analysis shows that, after the monopole condensation, the effective action of QCD could be approximated around the new vacuum by a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev action. Furthermore, our analysis strongly indicates that the mass scale in the Skyrme-Faddeev action is closely related to the confinement scale in QCD. This establishes a deep connection between a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev type non-linear sigma model and QCD which is remarkable. On the other hand the assertion that the Skyrme-Faddeev action could describe QCD in the infra-red limit is found to be misleading. In particular, it is highly unlikely that the Faddeev-Niemi knots can be realized in QCD.

To study a dynamical symmetry breaking induced by the monopole condensation one must first calculate the effective action of QCD under the monopole background. To do this one has to integrate out all the dynamical degrees of the non-Abelian gauge theory, leaving only the monopole configuration as the background. For this it is necessary for us to identify the monopole potential, and separate it from the generic QCD connection, in a gauge independent manner. This can be done with the gauge-independent decomposition of the non-Abelian gauge potential into the dual potential and the valence potential [4,5], which provides us a natural reparameterization of the non-Abelian connection in terms of the dual potential of the maximal Abelian subgroup H of the gauge group G and the gauge covariant vector field of the remaining G/H degrees. With this decomposition one can calculate the effective action of QCD using the background field method, and show that the monopole condensation takes place after one integrates out all the dynamical degrees of the non-Abelian gauge potential.

For simplicity we will consider $SU(2)$ QCD. A natural way to identify the monopole potential and to separate the topological degree is to introduce an isotriplet unit vector field $\hat{n}$ which selects the color direction at each space-time point, and to decompose the connection into the Abelian projection which leaves $\hat{n}$ invariant and the remaining part which forms a covariant vector field [4,5],

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{A}_\mu &= A_\mu \hat{n} - \frac{1}{g} \hat{n} \times \partial_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{X}_\mu = \hat{A}_\mu + \vec{X}_\mu, \\ (A_\mu &= \hat{n} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu, \hat{n}^2 = 1, \hat{n} \cdot \vec{X}_\mu = 0),\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where A_μ is the “electric” potential. Notice that the Abelian projection $\hat{A}_\mu$ is precisely the connection which leaves $\hat{n}$ invariant under the parallel transport,

$$\hat{D}_\mu \hat{n} = \partial_\mu \hat{n} + g \hat{A}_\mu \times \hat{n} = 0. \quad (2)$$

Under the infinitesimal gauge transformation

$$\delta \hat{n} = -\vec{\alpha} \times \hat{n}, \quad \delta \vec{A}_\mu = \frac{1}{g} D_\mu \vec{\alpha}, \quad (3)$$

one has [4,5]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_\mu &= \frac{1}{g} \hat{n} \cdot \partial_\mu \vec{\alpha}, \quad \delta \hat{A}_\mu = \frac{1}{g} \hat{D}_\mu \vec{\alpha}, \\ \delta \vec{X}_\mu &= -\vec{\alpha} \times \vec{X}_\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This shows that $\hat{A}_\mu$ by itself describes an $SU(2)$ connection which enjoys the full $SU(2)$ gauge degrees of freedom. Furthermore $\vec{X}_\mu$ transforms covariantly under the gauge transformation. This confirms that our decomposition provides a gauge-independent decomposition of the non-Abelian potential into the restricted part $\hat{A}_\mu$ and gauge covariant part $\vec{X}_\mu$. This decomposition, which has recently become known as the ‘‘Cho decomposition’’ [2] or the ‘‘Cho-Faddeev-Niemi-Shabanov decomposition’’ [10], was introduced long time ago in an attempt to demonstrate the monopole condensation in QCD [4,5]. But only recently the importance of the decomposition in clarifying the non-Abelian dynamics has become appreciated by many authors [2,9]. Indeed it is this decomposition which has played a crucial role to establish the possible connection between the Skyrme-Faddeev action and the effective action of QCD [8–10], and the Abelian dominance in the Wilson loops in QCD [11].

To understand the physical meaning of our decomposition notice that the restricted potential $\hat{A}_\mu$ actually has a dual structure. Indeed the field strength made of the restricted potential is decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} &= (F_{\mu\nu} + H_{\mu\nu})\hat{n}, \\ F_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu, \\ H_{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{1}{g} \hat{n} \cdot (\partial_\mu \hat{n} \times \partial_\nu \hat{n}) = \partial_\mu \tilde{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu \tilde{C}_\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{C}_\mu$ is the ‘‘magnetic’’ potential [4,5]. So one can identify the non-Abelian monopole potential by

$$\vec{C}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g} \hat{n} \times \partial_\mu \hat{n}, \quad (6)$$

in terms of which the magnetic field is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{H}_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu \vec{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu \vec{C}_\mu + g \vec{C}_\mu \times \vec{C}_\nu = -\frac{1}{g} \partial_\mu \hat{n} \times \partial_\nu \hat{n} \\ &= H_{\mu\nu} \hat{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Notice that the magnetic field has a remarkable structure

$$H_{\mu\alpha} H_{\alpha\beta} H_{\beta\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} H_{\alpha\beta}^2 H_{\mu\nu}, \quad (8)$$

which will be useful for us in the following.

Another important feature of $\hat{A}_\mu$ is that, as an $SU(2)$ potential, it retains the full topological characteristics of the original non-Abelian potential. Clearly the isolated singularities of $\hat{n}$ defines $\pi_2(S^2)$ which describes the non-Abelian monopoles. Indeed $\hat{A}_\mu$ with $A_\mu = 0$ and $\hat{n} = \hat{r}$ describes precisely the Wu-Yang monopole [12,13]. Besides, with the S^3 compactification of R^3 , $\hat{n}$ characterizes the Hopf invariant $\pi_3(S^2) \simeq \pi_3(S^3)$ which describes the topologically distinct vacua [14,15]. This tells that the restricted gauge theory made of $\hat{A}_\mu$ could describe the dual dynamics which should play an essential role in $SU(2)$ QCD [4,5].

With our decomposition (1) we have

$$\vec{F}_{\mu\nu} = \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} + \hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu + g \vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu, \quad (9)$$

so that the Yang-Mills Lagrangian is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{4} \vec{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 = -\frac{1}{4} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{g}{2} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \cdot (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} (\hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu)^2 - \frac{g^2}{4} (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This shows that the Yang-Mills theory can be viewed as the restricted gauge theory made of the Abelian projection, which has an additional gauge covariant charged vector field (the valence gluons) as its source [4,5].

With this preparation we will now derive the effective action of QCD in the presence of the monopole background, using the background field method [16,17]. So we first divide the gauge potential $\vec{A}_\mu$ into two parts, the slow-varying classical part $\vec{A}_\mu^{(c)}$ and the fluctuating quantum part $\vec{A}_\mu^{(q)}$, and identify the monopole potential $\vec{C}_\mu$ as the classical background,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{A}_\mu &= \vec{A}_\mu^{(c)} + \vec{A}_\mu^{(q)}, \\ \vec{A}_\mu^{(c)} &= \vec{C}_\mu, \quad \vec{A}_\mu^{(q)} = A_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{X}_\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

With this we introduce two types of gauge transformations, the background gauge transformation and the physical gauge transformation. Naturally we identify the background gauge transformation as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \vec{C}_\mu &= \frac{1}{g} \bar{D}_\mu \vec{\alpha}, \\ \delta (A_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{X}_\mu) &= -\vec{\alpha} \times (A_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{X}_\mu), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where now $\bar{D}_\mu$ is defined with only the background potential $\vec{C}_\mu$

$$\bar{D}_\mu = (\partial_\mu + g \vec{C}_\mu \times). \quad (13)$$

As for the physical gauge transformation which leaves the background potential invariant, we must have

$$\delta \vec{C}_\mu = 0, \quad \delta(A_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{X}_\mu) = \frac{1}{g} D_\mu \vec{\alpha}. \quad (14)$$

Notice that both (12) and (14) respect the original gauge transformation,

$$\delta \vec{A}_\mu = \frac{1}{g} D_\mu \vec{\alpha}.$$

Now, we fix the gauge by imposing the following gauge condition to the quantum fields,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{F} &= \vec{D}_\mu(A_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{X}_\mu) = 0, \\ \mathcal{L}_{gf} &= -\frac{1}{2\xi} \left[(\partial_\mu A_\mu)^2 + (\vec{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\mu)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The corresponding Faddeev-Popov determinant is given by

$$M_{FP}^{ab} = \frac{\delta F^a}{\delta \alpha^b} = (\vec{D}_\mu D_\mu)^{ab}. \quad (16)$$

With this gauge fixing the effective action takes the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\vec{C}_\mu) &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\vec{X}_\mu \mathcal{D}\vec{c} \mathcal{D}\vec{c}^* \exp \left\{ i \int \left[-\frac{1}{4} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} (\hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu)^2 - \frac{g}{2} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \cdot (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu) \\ &\quad - \frac{g^2}{4} (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu)^2 + \vec{c}^* \vec{D}_\mu D_\mu \vec{c} \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2\xi} (\partial_\mu A_\mu)^2 - \frac{1}{2\xi} (\vec{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\mu)^2 \right] d^4x \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\vec{c}$ and $\vec{c}^*$ are the ghost fields. Notice that the effective action is explicitly invariant under the background gauge transformation (12), if we treat the ghost fields as quantum fields and add the following gauge transformation of the ghost fields to (12),

$$\delta \vec{c} = -\alpha \times \vec{c}, \quad \delta \vec{c}^* = -\alpha \times \vec{c}^*. \quad (18)$$

This guarantees that the resulting effective action we obtain after the functional integral should be invariant under the remaining background gauge transformation which involves only $\vec{C}_\mu$. This, of course, is the advantage of the background field method which greatly simplifies the calculation of the effective action [16,17].

Now, we can perform the functional integral in (17). Remember that in one loop approximation only the terms quadratic in quantum fields become relevant in the functional integral. So the A_μ integration becomes trivial,

and the $\vec{X}_\mu$ and ghost integrations result in the following functional determinants (with $\xi = 1$),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Det}^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_{\mu\nu}^{ab} &\simeq \text{Det}^{-\frac{1}{2}} [g_{\mu\nu} (\vec{D}\vec{D})^{ab} - 2g H_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^{abc} n^c], \\ \text{Det} M_{FP}^{ab} &\simeq \text{Det} (\vec{D}\vec{D})^{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

One can simplify the determinant K using the relation (8),

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \text{Det}^{-\frac{1}{2}} K &= -\ln \text{Det} (\vec{D}\vec{D})^{ab} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \ln \text{Det} [(\vec{D}\vec{D})^{ab} + i\sqrt{2}g H \epsilon^{abc} n^c] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \ln \text{Det} [(\vec{D}\vec{D})^{ab} - i\sqrt{2}g H \epsilon^{abc} n^c], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $H = \sqrt{\vec{H}_{\mu\nu}^2}$. With this the one loop contribution of the functional determinants to the effective action can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S &= i \ln \text{Det} (\vec{D}^2 + \sqrt{2}g H) \\ &\quad + i \ln \text{Det} (\vec{D}^2 - \sqrt{2}g H), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where now $\vec{D}_\mu$ acquires the following Abelian form,

$$\vec{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu + ig \vec{C}_\mu.$$

Notice that the reason for this simplification is precisely because $\vec{C}_\mu$ originates from the Abelian projection. One can evaluate the functional determinants in (21) with the Fock-Schwinger proper time method, and for a constant background H we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t^2} \frac{gH/\sqrt{2}\mu^2}{\sinh(gHt/\sqrt{2}\mu^2)} \\ &\quad \times [\exp(-\sqrt{2}gHt/\mu^2) + \exp(\sqrt{2}gHt/\mu^2)], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where μ is a dimensional parameter. The integral contains the (usual) ultra-violet divergence around $t \simeq 0$, but notice that it is also plagued by a severe infra-red divergence around $t \simeq \infty$. This is because the functional determinant (21) contains negative eigenvalues, whose eigenfunctions become tachyonic in the infra-red region. More precisely when the momentum k of the gluon parallel to the background magnetic field becomes smaller than the background field strength (i.e., when $k^2 < gH/\sqrt{2}$), the lowest Landau level gluon eigenfunction whose spin is parallel to the magnetic field acquires an imaginary energy and thus becomes tachyonic. So to calculate the functional determinant we must exclude these unphysical tachyonic modes which causes the infra-red instability.

The correct infra-red regularization is dictated by the causality. To implement the causality in (22) we first go to the Minkowski time with the Wick rotation, and find

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathcal{L} &= \Delta\mathcal{L}_+ + \Delta\mathcal{L}_-, \\
\Delta\mathcal{L}_+ &= -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t^2} \frac{gH/\sqrt{2}\mu^2}{\sin(gHt/\sqrt{2}\mu^2)} \\
&\quad \times [\exp(-i\sqrt{2}gHt/\mu^2)], \\
\Delta\mathcal{L}_- &= -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t^2} \frac{gH/\sqrt{2}\mu^2}{\sin(gHt/\sqrt{2}\mu^2)} \\
&\quad \times [\exp(+i\sqrt{2}gHt/\mu^2)].
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In this form the infra-red divergence has disappeared, but now we face the ambiguity in choosing the correct contours of the integrals in (23). Fortunately this ambiguity can be resolved by the causality. Remember that the two integrals $\Delta\mathcal{L}_+$ and $\Delta\mathcal{L}_-$ originate from the two determinants in (21), and the standard causality argument requires us to identify $\sqrt{2}gH$ in the first determinant as $\sqrt{2}gH - i\epsilon$ but in the second determinant as $\sqrt{2}gH + i\epsilon$. This tells that the poles in the first integral in (23) should lie above the real axis, but the poles in the second integral should lie below the real axis. From this we conclude that the contour in $\Delta\mathcal{L}_+$ should pass below the real axis, but the contour in $\Delta\mathcal{L}_-$ should pass above the real axis. With this causality requirement the two integrals become identical, so that we finally have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{gH/\sqrt{2}\mu^2}{\sinh(gHt/\sqrt{2}\mu^2)} \\
&\quad \times [\exp(-\sqrt{2}gHt/\mu^2) + \exp(-\sqrt{2}gHt/\mu^2)],
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where now ϵ is the ultra-violet cutoff which we have introduced to regularize the ultra-violet divergence.

From these infra-red and ultra-violet regularization we finally obtain the following effective Lagrangian of QCD (with the modified minimal subtraction)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{eff} &= -\frac{1}{4}H^2 - \frac{11g^2}{96\pi^2}H^2(\ln \frac{gH}{\mu^2} - c), \\
c &= 1 + \frac{15}{22}\ln 2 + \frac{12}{11}\zeta'(-1) = 1.2921409\dots,
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where now $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann's zeta function. This completes our derivation of the one-loop effective Lagrangian of $SU(2)$ QCD in the presence of the monopole background. Notice that, as expected, the effective lagrangian is explicitly invariant under the background gauge transformation (12).

We emphasize that our infra-red regularization by causality naturally excludes the tachyonic modes from the functional integral. This is because the tachyonic modes will certainly violate the causality, and should be forbidden by the causality. Including the tachyons in the physical spectrum will surely destabilize QCD and make it ill-defined.

Clearly the effective action provides the following non-trivial effective potential

$$V = \frac{1}{4}H^2 \left[1 + \frac{11g^2}{24\pi^2} (\ln \frac{gH}{\mu^2} - c) \right], \tag{26}$$

which generates a non-trivial local minimum at

$$\langle H \rangle = \frac{\mu^2}{g} \exp \left(-\frac{24\pi^2}{11g^2} + c - \frac{1}{2} \right). \tag{27}$$

This is nothing but the desired magnetic condensation. *This proves that the one loop effective action of QCD in the presence of the constant magnetic background does generate a dynamical symmetry breaking thorough the monopole condensation.*

To check the consistency of our result with the perturbative QCD we now discuss the running coupling and the renormalization. For this we define the running coupling $\bar{g}$ by

$$\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial H^2} \Big|_{H=\bar{\mu}^2} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g^2}{\bar{g}^2}. \tag{28}$$

With this we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\bar{g}^2} = \frac{1}{g^2} + \frac{11}{24\pi^2} \left(\ln \frac{g\bar{\mu}^2}{\mu^2} - c + \frac{3}{2} \right), \tag{29}$$

and the following β -function,

$$\beta(\bar{\mu}) = -\frac{11}{24\pi^2} \bar{g}^3, \tag{30}$$

which exactly coincides with the well-known asymptotic freedom result [18]. In terms of the running coupling the renormalized potential is given by

$$V_{\text{ren}} \simeq \frac{1}{4}H^2 \left[1 + \frac{11\bar{g}^2}{24\pi^2} (\ln \frac{H}{\bar{\mu}^2} - \frac{3}{2}) \right]. \tag{31}$$

From this we obtain the following Callan-Symanzik equation

$$\left(\bar{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\mu}} + \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{g}} - \gamma \bar{C}_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{C}_\mu} \right) V_{\text{ren}} \simeq 0, \tag{32}$$

where γ is the anomalous dimension for $\bar{C}_\mu$,

$$\gamma = -\frac{11}{24\pi^2} \bar{g}^2. \tag{33}$$

This proves the renormalization group invariance of our effective potential.

The fact that our effective potential (26) and the resulting vacuum (27) are expressed in terms of H assures

that they are explicitly gauge and Lorentz invariant. On the other hand notice that, in terms of the magnetic potential $\vec{C}_\mu$, the effective potential could be written as

$$V = \frac{g^2}{4} (\vec{C}_\mu \times \vec{C}_\nu)^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{11g^2}{24\pi^2} \left[\ln \frac{g[(\vec{C}_\mu \times \vec{C}_\nu)^2]^{1/2}}{\mu^2} - c \right] \right\}, \quad (34)$$

Now, just for a heuristic reason, suppose we choose a particular Lorentz frame and express the vacuum (27) by the vacuum expectation value of $\vec{C}_\mu$. In this picture the above effective potential generates the following mass matrix for $\vec{C}_\mu$,

$$M_{ij}^{\mu\nu} = \left\langle \frac{\delta^2 V}{\delta C_\mu^i \delta C_\nu^j} \right\rangle = m^2 (\delta_{ij} - n_i n_j) g^{\mu\nu},$$

$$m^2 = \frac{11g^4}{96\pi^2} \left\langle \frac{(\vec{C}_\mu \times \vec{H}_{\mu\nu})^2}{H^2} \right\rangle, \quad (35)$$

where m can be interpreted as the “effective mass” for $\vec{C}_\mu$. This demonstrates that the magnetic condensation indeed generates the mass gap necessary for the dual Meissner effect and the confinement.

With the above understanding we can now study the possible connection between the Skyrme-Faddeev action and the effective action of QCD. To do this we first expand the effective potential in terms of the magnetic potential around the vacuum and make the following approximation,

$$V \simeq V_0 + \frac{1}{2!} \left\langle \frac{\delta^2 V}{\delta C_\mu^i \delta C_\nu^j} \right\rangle \bar{C}_\mu^i \bar{C}_\nu^j$$

$$+ \frac{1}{3!} \left\langle \frac{\delta^3 V}{\delta C_\mu^i \delta C_\nu^j \delta C_\rho^k} \right\rangle \bar{C}_\mu^i \bar{C}_\nu^j \bar{C}_\rho^k$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4!} \left\langle \frac{\delta^4 V}{\delta C_\mu^i \delta C_\nu^j \delta C_\rho^k \delta C_\sigma^l} \right\rangle \bar{C}_\mu^i \bar{C}_\nu^j \bar{C}_\rho^k \bar{C}_\sigma^l, \quad (36)$$

where

$$\bar{C}_\mu^i = C_\mu^i - \langle C_\mu^i \rangle.$$

Notice that here we have neglected the higher order terms and kept only the quartic polynomial in $\vec{C}_\mu$ for simplicity. In this case the corresponding effective Lagrangian will acquire the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} \simeq -\frac{1}{2} m^2 (\vec{C}_\mu)^2 - \frac{\alpha}{4} (\vec{C}_\mu \times \vec{C}_\nu)^2$$

$$- \frac{\beta}{4} (\vec{C}_\mu \cdot \vec{C}_\nu)^2 - \frac{\gamma}{4} (\vec{C}_\mu)^4 + \dots$$

$$= -\frac{m^2}{2g^2} (\partial_\mu \hat{n})^2 - \frac{\alpha}{4g^2} (\partial_\mu \hat{n} \times \partial_\nu \hat{n})^2$$

$$- \frac{\beta}{4g^2} (\partial_\mu \hat{n} \cdot \partial_\nu \hat{n})^2 - \frac{\gamma}{4g^2} (\partial_\mu \hat{n})^4 + \dots, \quad (37)$$

where α , β , and γ are numerical parameters determined by (36). This is nothing but a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev Lagrangian [1]. This shows that one can indeed derive a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev action from QCD by expanding the effective potential around the vacuum.

But there are two points that should be emphasized here. First, our approximation (37) is by no means exact. For example, we have assumed a constant magnetic background to derive the effective action. So our analysis establishes a possible connection between a generalized non-linear sigma model of Skyrme-Faddeev type and QCD only in a limited sense. In particular it does not assert that the simple Skyrme-Faddeev action could describe QCD in the infra-red limit. Secondly, we had to choose a particular Lorentz frame to justify the expansion (36) of the effective action around the vacuum. So our argument appears to have compromised the Lorentz invariance, although the final effective Lagrangian (37) is obviously Lorentz invariant. In spite of these drawbacks our analysis strongly endorses the fact that the Skyrme-Faddeev action has something in common with QCD, which is truly remarkable.

Similar result has recently been obtained by many authors [8–10]. But a new feature in our analysis is that the resulting Skyrme-Faddeev action is intimately connected to the monopole condensation in QCD. In particular our analysis makes it clear that the mass scale in the Skyrme-Faddeev action is directly related to the mass of the monopole potential, which determines the confinement scale in QCD. This is not surprising. Indeed any attempt to relate the Skyrme-Faddeev action to QCD must produce the mass scale that the Skyrme-Faddeev action contains, and the only way to interpret this mass scale in QCD is through the confinement.

It must be emphasized that our decomposition (1) has played the central role in our calculation of the effective action of QCD. It is this decomposition which allows us to integrate out the gauge covariant part of the gluons without breaking the gauge invariance, and reduce the non-Abelian dynamics effectively into an Abelian form which has a charged vector source. In particular it is this decomposition which allows us the gauge-independent separation of the monopole background from the dynamical degrees of the non-Abelian gauge theory. We conclude with the following remarks:

1) One might question (legitimately) the validity of the one loop approximation, since in the infra-red limit the non-perturbative effect is supposed to play the essential role in QCD. Our attitude on this issue is that QCD can be viewed as the perturbative extension of the topological field theory described by the restricted QCD, so that the non-perturbative effect in the low energy limit can effectively be represented by the topological structure of the restricted gauge theory. This is reasonable, because

the large scale structure of the monopole topology naturally describes the long range behavior of the theory. In fact one can show that it is the restricted connection that plays a crucial role in the Wilson loop integral, which provides the confinement criterion in QCD [11]. So we believe that our classical monopole background (with the monopole charge $1/g$) automatically takes care of the essential feature of the non-perturbative effect, which should make the one loop approximation reliable.

2) One may notice that our vacuum (27) looks very much like the old “Savvidy vacuum” [6]. But, unlike the Savvidy vacuum, ours is stable. This is precisely because our infra-red regularization by causality excludes the unphysical tachyonic modes in our calculation of the functional integral (17). The tachyonic modes in the functional integral, if included, will generate an imaginary (absorptive) part in the effective action, which should destabilize the monopole condensation. Indeed this was the origin of the instability of the Savvidy vacuum. We don’t have this instability. The stability of our vacuum is guaranteed by the causality. Of course one might question the wisdom of our infra-red regularization by causality. Indeed the issue of what infra-red regularization procedure one should adopt is the central issue in QCD, which certainly need a more careful examination. Here we simply point out that we have other independent justifications which support our infra-red regularization by causality [7,19]. Only with the exclusion of the unphysical modes one can obtain a consistent theory of QCD.

3) We emphasize that, independent of the stability of the monopole condensation, the real (dispersive) part of the effective action of QCD can indeed be related to a generalized Skyrme-Faddeev action around the local minimum. This is remarkable. On the other hand it should be emphasized that it is highly unlikely that the Faddeev-Niemi knots can actually be realized in QCD. This is because the Faddeev-Niemi knots are made of the (color) magnetic flux, while the QCD knots (if possible at all) should consist of the (color) electric flux. So at best the Faddeev-Niemi knots could be interpreted as a “dual” description of the possible QCD knots. If this is so, the really interesting question now is whether QCD could admit the color electric knots which could be interpreted as the new glueball states. This question is worth a further investigation.

It must be clear from our analysis that the existence of the magnetic condensation (independent of its stability) is a generic feature of the non-Abelian gauge theory. Whether this condensation should describe the true vacuum of QCD or not, of course, is the most important issue in QCD. This issue, and the generalization of our result to $SU(3)$, will be discussed in a forthcoming paper [19].

The work is supported in part by Korean Science and Engineering Foundation (KRF-2000-015-BP0072), and

by the BK21 project of Ministry of Education.

-
- [1] L. Faddeev and A. Niemi, *Nature* **387**, 58 (1997); R. Battye and P. Sutcliffe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 4798 (1998).
 - [2] L. Faddeev and A. Niemi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1624 (1999); *Phys. Lett.* **B449**, 214 (1999); **B464**, 90 (1999).
 - [3] Y. Nambu, *Phys. Rev.* **D10**, 4262 (1974); S. Mandelstam, *Phys. Rep.* **23C**, 245 (1976); A. Polyakov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B120**, 429 (1977); G. ’t Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B190**, 455 (1981).
 - [4] Y. M. Cho, *Phys. Rev.* **D21**, 1080 (1980); *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **17**, 266 (1984).
 - [5] Y. M. Cho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46**, 302 (1981); *Phys. Rev.* **D23**, 2415 (1981).
 - [6] G. K. Savvidy, *Phys. Lett.* **B71**, 133 (1977); N. K. Nielsen and P. Olesen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B144**, 485 (1978); A. Yildiz and P. Cox, *Phys. Rev.* **D21**, 1095 (1980); M. Claudson, A. Yildiz, and P. Cox, *Phys. Rev.* **D22**, 2022 (1980); W. Dittrich and M. Reuter, *Phys. Lett.* **B128**, 321, (1983); C. Flory, *Phys. Rev.* **D28**, 1425 (1983); S. K. Blau, M. Visser, and A. Wipf, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A6**, 5409 (1991); M. Reuter, M. G. Schmidt, and C. Schubert, *Ann. Phys.* **259**, 313 (1997).
 - [7] V. Schanbacher, *Phys. Rev.* **D26**, 489 (1982).
 - [8] Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **38**, 151 (2001); Y. M. Cho, H. W. Lee, and D. G. Pak, hep-th/9905215.
 - [9] E. Langman and A. Niemi, *Phys. Lett.* **B463**, 252 (1999); S. Shabanov, *Phys. Lett.* **B458**, 322 (1999); **B463**, 263 (1999).
 - [10] H. Gies, hep-th/0102026.
 - [11] Y. M. Cho, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 074009-1 (2000).
 - [12] T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **D12**, 3845 (1975).
 - [13] Y. M. Cho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 1115 (1980); *Phys. Lett.* **B115**, 125 (1982).
 - [14] A. Belavin, A. Polyakov, A. Schwartz, and Y. Tyupkin, *Phys. Lett.* **59B**, 85 (1975); Y. M. Cho, *Phys. Lett.* **B81**, 25 (1979).
 - [15] G. ’t Hooft, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 8 (1976); R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 172 (1976); C. Callan, R. Dashen, and D. G. Gross, *Phys. Lett.* **63B**, 334 (1976).
 - [16] B. de Witt, *Phys. Rev.* **162**, 1195 (1967); 1239 (1969).
 - [17] See for example, C. Itzikson and J. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (McGraw-Hill) 1985; M. Peskin and D. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Addison-Wesley) 1995; S. Weinberg, *Quantum Theory of Fields* (Cambridge Univ. Press) 1996.
 - [18] D. Gross and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 1343 (1973); H. Politzer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 1346 (1973).
 - [19] Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, in *Proceedings of TMU-Yale Symposium on Dynamics of Gauge Fields*, edited by T. Appelquist and H. Minakata (Universal Academy Press, Tokyo) 1999; Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, hep-th/0006051, submitted to *Phys. Rev. D*.